York City police officers who broke down the door of two individuals who were putting finishing touches on the device.

Since then major media outlets in New York City were the subject of anthrax attacks. In February of 2003 a seasoned al Qaeda operative named Ivman Faris was in New York City on a mission to destroy the Brooklyn Bridge. Faris fought alongside bin Laden, engaged in a battle which included the wholesale slaughter of Russian prisoners and helped supply al Qaeda fighters more recently with sleeping bags, airline tickets, cash and cell phones.

Nearly 2 years after the destruction of the Trade Center, Faris was in New York City conducting surveillance on the Brooklyn Bridge. Faris reported back to his handlers that "the weather is too hot." meaning that security was too tight for the plot to succeed. He was deterred this time.

New York City nevertheless remains

a prime al Qaeda target.

Most recently, just before the 2004 Republican National Convention in New York City, two suspected terrorists were arrested for yet another plot to destroy the subway system, this time near Herald Square in midtown Manhattan.

I think it is in our national interest to move this process forward to a point that just makes sense. It is one thing for Congress to come together and compromise how much of the funding is distributed among the States and towns and villages and cities across the country, for example, agricultural funding or funding for our national security; but when it comes to the lives of the American people and the millions of people who come to our shores annually, it is responsible and above all it is not a Democrat or Republican issue. It is just common sense to send the money where it is needed the most. That is what this bill seeks to do.

TALE OF TWO YOUNG MEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Poe) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about two young men. They both grew up in Houston, Texas. They both grew up without any family support. They both were basically raised by others. They were both named Michael. And they both chose careers in the criminal justice system.

Michael Lopez chose in the criminal justice system the career of crime. He started committing violent crimes at the age of 11. He spent a lot of time in and out of the criminal justice system. He was a gang member, a drug abuser, committed numerous robberies against other juveniles, a burglar, and a thug in his own community.

Michael Eakin also chose criminal justice as a career, but he chose it as a police officer. Their paths crossed on a quiet peaceful night in Houston, Texas, after Officer Eakin stopped Lopez and his fellow gang members who were cruising Houston, Texas, looking for criminal opportunities.

When Officer Eakin stopped the vehicle, Lopez jumped from the vehicle, took off running and Officer Eakin made the decision to chase Michael Lopez. After capturing Lopez, Lopez pulled out a pistol, pointed it at point blank range and shot Officer Eakin, and then he fled in the darkness of the night.

Lopez was 17 and on probation for criminal offenses. Eakin was 24 and a rookie police officer. Lopez was charged with capital murder of a police officer. In Texas, a 17-year-old is an adult by State law for criminal law purposes and not a juvenile.

It is a long-established rule of law that the States determine the age of accountability for criminal law purposes. Not the Federal Government, not the Federal courts.

I was the judge in the Lopez case, having been a judge for 22 years in criminal cases. A jury heard the case in my court. A jury found the defendant Michael Lopez guilty of capital murder of a police officer. Court TV even showed this on national television. The same jury unanimously found the defendant would be a continuing threat to society in the future. The jury unanimously found there was no mitigation that would warrant a sentence less than death with Michael Lopez.

The defendant was assessed the death penalty by a jury in 6 hours. During sentencing I referred to the defendant as a street terrorist based upon the evidence in the case. On appeal, the highest court in Texas referred to the defendant as a mean little guy and upheld the death penalty.

Now the Supreme Court has gotten involved in these types of cases and declared once and for all that no one 17 or under can be executed for the crimes that they commit. Citing international court decisions and the so-called evolving United States Constitution, the Court vesterday struck down these types of cases five to four.

The Supreme Court of the United States should not look to foreign courts for guidance but to the United States Constitution because that is what they are sworn to uphold. The Supreme Court once again has discriminated against victims based upon the age of the defendant. Whether or not a person agrees or disagrees with the death penalty, whether or not a person feels the age of accountability should be 17 or 18 or 21, there is no precedent in law that the Supreme Court may arbitrarily say a 17-year-old is a mere child and an 18-vear-old is an adult.

The Supreme Court has once again promoted the philosophy that America

is becoming the land of excusable conduct in our criminal courts. There should be consequences for criminal conduct even for 17-year-olds.

The Supreme Court has replaced the law of the land with its own personal opinion and European thought. This is an affront to the rule of law, to the Constitution, to the 10th amendment. It is an affront to the peace officers in the United States, and it is an affront to Officer Michael Eakin and his fam-

GREEN RIVER KILLER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I am a new Member of this body, and I am proud and humble to serve the 8th District of the State of Washington. I am also honored and privileged today to address this body.

My first address is on a very serious note, but I think it is a necessary one for us to talk about because it affects and impacts the young women and children in our community. It is the future of our country.

For 33 years I had the privilege of serving in law enforcement in King County which is the Seattle area of Washington State. And I served in a number of different capacities, but in one of those capacities I served as the lead investigator in the most notorious serial killer case in this Nation's history.

Mr. Speaker, we had a monster who was stalking our young women and children in our community. These were young women and children who were lost; children who were afraid; who in some cases were driven from their homes by domestic violence, drug abuse, alcohol abuse, emotional and physical abuse. Some, though, were lured away from their homes by people who preyed on their weakness and their vulnerability. They were lured into an environment of street life where drugs and alcohol are rampant, where prostitution is rampant; and they were told they were going to live the life of luxury, fast money, fast cars, and freedom. Instead, their lives ended. They just ended. The promises for a better life by these predators were all lies.

Our community was gripped by fear by this monster who literally grabbed our children by the throat and snuffed out their lives, their hopes, and their dreams. This monster struck at the very hearts of our communities: our children. And my purpose today is to stand before you, Mr. Speaker, to tell this story, to honor the victims so that we never forget the victims, to remind us of all the families who are still suffering the losses of their loved ones